

Re: FW: Chuitna Mine -status, next steps



Powell,

William Beckwith

to: James E (DEC)

05/04/2011 01:59 PM

Jim - Thanks for the update. Will look at Phyllis's final iron report as soon as a can.

Attached is a review of the manganese report that I received last week from an Environmental Scientist in EPA's Health and Ecological Criteria Division. It can be forwarded to Dan Graham/PacRim, but thought you should see it first. Suspect it will generate a need for discussion. I have made note on a few occasions that EPA was looking further at the manganese report, including the question of removing numeric values that protect against organoleptic effects. The review does not address the organoleptic question, which EPA is still discussing.

As for a meeting the week of 5/23/11, I need to speak with management before I commit to anything. Sorry about that, but my priority has been set for the next month or so.

- Bill 206-553-2495



AK WQS Chuitna PacRim_Manganese_Alaska_4-28-11[1].pdf

"Powell, James E (DEC)"

04/29/2011 12:26:06 PM

From: "Powell, James E (DEC)" < jim.powell@alaska.gov>

William Beckwith/R10/USEPA/US@EPA To:

Cc: "Sonafrank, Nancy B (DEC)" <nancy.sonafrank@alaska.gov>,

"McGee, William D (DEC)" <william.mcgee@alaska.gov>, "Nakanishi, Allan S (DEC)" <allan.nakanishi@alaska.gov>

Date: 04/29/2011 12:26 PM

Subject: FW: Chuitna Mine -status, next steps

Bill, Lynn Kent has asked that I forward you the email below. It's an outline, not complete, but hopefully catches the status of the SSC for Chuitna.

Please notice in the status below that PacRim and DEC want to meet with you sometime during the week of May 23rd in Anchorage or Seattle. I anticipate a similar format and participants. At this proposed meeting, assuming I receive PacRim's WER final information, we would like to discuss with you, PacRim, and other DEC folks the WER metals, manganese AND the draft study design for Iron. I am currently

writing a discussion draft decision document for the WER and Manganese that I anticipate will be sent to you for your review the week of May 9th. That document is intended to be used at the meeting. The meeting date is contingent on having the draft study design for Iron from PacRim and Discussion Draft decision document ready and distributed to you and others in time for the meeting. As things progress I'll keep you looped in. Additionally, attached is Phyllis's final report on Iron that we received yesterday. jim ----Original Message----From: Kent, Lynn J T (DEC) Sent: Friday, April 29, 2011 10:29 AM To: Powell, James E (DEC) Cc: McGee, William D (DEC); Nakanishi, Allan S (DEC); Sonafrank, Nancy B (DEC) Subject: RE: Follow up infomation Thanks Jim - please make sure Bill B is getting the documents as we get them. I understand from Mike Bussell that Bill has been assigned to assist, so that should not be a problem. Please also give Bill the summary and next steps. . . Lynn ----Original Message----From: Powell, James E (DEC) Sent: Friday, April 29, 2011 9:53 AM To: Kent, Lynn J T (DEC); Nakanishi, Allan S (DEC); Sonafrank, Nancy B (DEC) Cc: McGee, William D (DEC) Subject: RE: Follow up infomation Lynn: Good to hear we have EPA support. We will need it. Below is a quick status, basically PacRim is still working on one of 3 components. Pete and Allan please chime in if I missed or incorrectly characterized something.

QUICK STATUS: There are three components to the

package - 1) WER metalswaiting on final report from PacRim, 2) Manganese ready, and 3)
Iron-final lab/field wk is being planned this summer.

DESCRIPTION:

- 1) WER: PacRim told us on Tuesday they are sending the final report on the WER Multiple tests this week or next.
- 2) Iron: During the past 3 weeks we had 4 teleconferenced with our contractor (Phyllis Scannell Weber) - some with PacRim and one with EPA. These discussions were focused on Phyllis's draft report which identifies a few gaps in the data. Her final report was received yesterday. I think it's fair to say all generally agreed there are still gaps in the data. Based on Tuesday's teleconference PacRim is preparing a study design to fill the gaps by conducting a few additional field/lab tests during this summer. We anticipate coming to closure on Iron late summer or early fall.
- 3) Manganese: Basically finished, PacRim's proposal and information has been submitted and EPA has reviewed it.

NEXT STEPS:

- 1) Draft Decision Document: I have started drafting the decision document focused on the WER and Manganese components.
- 2) We are considering a face to face meeting (EPA, DEC, PacRim) the week of May 23 in Seattle or Anchorage to get Bill Beckwith's time and attention. At that meeting our objective is to finalize the draft proposal for the WER and Manganese AND study design components. The last face to face was very productive.

WE WILL NEED EPA'S SUPPORT TO SECURE BILL'S TIME FOR PREPARATION AND ATTENDANCE. IF we are unsuccessful in scheduling Bill's time and attention we will be sure to let you know.

3) We anticipate having the SSC package to public notice early fall. PacRim anticipates having their EIS January 2012.

----Original Message----From: Kent, Lynn J T (DEC) Sent: Friday, April 29, 2011 9:12 AM To: Nakanishi, Allan S (DEC); Powell, James E (DEC); Sonafrank, Nancy B (DEC) Subject: FW: Follow up infomation Pls. see note at the bottom - EPA has resources to assist with Chuitna now so don't delay in getting them what they need. Thanks

Lynn

----Original Message----From: Bussell.Mike@epamail.epa.gov [mailto:Bussell.Mike@epamail.epa.gov]

Sent: Thursday, April 28, 2011 4:06 PM To: Kent, Lynn J T (DEC) Subject: Follow up infomation

Hello Lynn,

You had asked earlier for add'l information concerning our comment in the Unalaska letter on villages currently under secondary treatment requirements. This first list includes those with 2ndary in their NPDES permits and a few others addressed in state only permits. I understand the spread sheet info (2nd attachment) was pulled together previously by our staffs to inform earlier discussions.

(See attached file: AK Communities.docx)(See attached file: Federal_Register_9 7 1979 (DRAFT).xlsx)

Also, we are able to give your Chuitna site specific criteria package some further review prior to formal submittal, if you want to send it down.

Thanks

[attachment "Scannel_review.docx" deleted by William Beckwith/R10/USEPA/US]